REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 9-12, 14-30 and 33-42 remain pending in the application, as claim 13 has been canceled without prejudice, claims 6-8 and claims 31 and 32 were previously canceled without prejudice and new dependent claims 40-42 have been added. In the Office Action, claims 1-30 and 33-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0134636 to Sundar, et al. (Sundar) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0137902 to Chaskar, et al. (Chaskar). In addition, claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chasker.

A brief summary of the Sundar reference may be helpful here. Sundar discloses a method, system and apparatus for a mobile station to sense and select a wireless local area network (WLAN) or a wide area mobile wireless network (WWAN). In particular, the WWAN determines when a mobile unit may enter the coverage area of a WLAN service in a building. The WWAN then signals the mobile unit to begin sensing for the WLAN. Upon successful detection of a beacon from an access point (AP) of the WLAN, the mobile unit deregisters from the WWAN and registers with a mobile switching center (MSC) serving the WLAN. As it roams through the WLAN, the mobile unit will continue to sense the RF energy strength of the WWAN. If it detects that the WLAN RF signal strength decreases below a threshold value and the WWAN strength is above a threshold value, the mobile station will initiate a registration process with the WWAN (see para. 0069).

Chaskar describes a method and apparatus for controlling handover between a first technology network and a second technology network. In particular, the first

network is a WLAN, and the second network is a cellular network. The WLAN includes cells inside a building that are located near entry/exit points of the building and cells inside the building that are positioned away from such points. The access points of the cells that are near the entry/exit points broadcast border bits indicating such, while the access points of the remaining cells broadcast border bits noting that they are not near entry/exit points. Through these border bits, a mobile device can determine when to perform a handoff procedure to the cellular network (see paragraphs 0044-0045). Several points of entry/exit of a building are shown in FIG. 2.

Independent claims 1, 18, 20, 23 and 25 have been amended to clarify or already include the feature that the first signal is detected from an egress portal in which the first signal indicates passage through the egress portal and that the egress portal resides within a cell of a WLAN and occupies a region that is smaller than the WLAN cell. Support for the amendments can be found in FIGs. 3 and 4 and on page 11, line 20 to page 12, line 3 and page 16, lines 5-11. No new matter has been added in view of this amendment.

Neither Sundar nor Chaskar disclose, illustrate, teach or suggest such a concept. Specifically, the mobile unit in Sundar, once it registers with the WLAN, will continue to monitor both the WLAN and WWAN signal strengths. Because Sundar does not disclose the idea of an egress portal that resides within a cell of a WLAN and that occupies a region that is smaller than the cell, the mobile unit of Sundar will continue to monitor the WWAN signal strength no matter where in a particular cell the unit is located. This process is in direct contrast to the idea proposed by the present invention, which can prevent a mobile unit from needlessly searching for or monitoring a WWAN.

Although Chaskar does show entry/exit doors of a building, Chaskar simply does not teach the concept of an egress portal that communicates signals to a mobile unit, as these entry/exit doors cannot transmit signals. Moreover, the cells in Chaskar are WLAN cells, and they cannot be considered egress portals because they do not reside within a cell of a WLAN and occupy a region that is smaller than the cell of the WLAN. Additionally, the access points in Chasker that transmit the border bits cannot be considered egress portals because it is physically impossible to pass through them. The cells of the WLAN of Chaskar may be passed through, but the access points cannot be.

The use of the egress portal in the present invention is to provide an additional trigger to determine when to handover from a first network to a second network. This additional trigger can prevent a mobile unit from accidentally registering with the second network, which may happen if a person walks towards an entry/exit point of a building but has no intention of leaving. Sundar and Chaskar simply do not take such a scenario into account and have neither the structure nor description to carry out such a concept.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the status information can include a wide area network information indicator. Support for the amendment can be found on page 6, lines 12-13 and on page 17, lines 1-7. No new matter has been added in view of this amendment. Such a feature - which may allow the mobile unit, while receiving signals from the WLAN, to determine information about the availability of WAN services - is never described in either Sundar or Chaskar.

Independent claims 17 and 30 have been amended to clarify that the border cells are inner and outer border cells and that the inner border cell broadcasts an inner

border cell indicator and the outer border cell broadcasts an outer border cell indicator. Support for the amendments can be found in FIG. 10 and on page 20, lines 10-11. No new matter has been added in view of these amendments. Neither Sundar nor Chaskar describe or suggest the concept of inner and outer border cells respectively broadcasting inner and outer border cell indicators. Like the egress portal, the inner and outer border cells can limit accidental registrations with a second network, something not envisioned by the prior art.

Independent claim 39 has been amended to clarify that the egress portal detects a movement of the mobile device from a coverage area of the first network to a coverage area of a second network, the second network being the other one of the WLAN or the WAN. Also, claim 39 has been amended to clarify that in response to detecting the movement of the mobile device, the mobile device can be advised to switch to the second network and conducting, in response to advising the mobile device to switch to the second network, the call via the second network. Support for the amendment can be found on page 22, line 13 to page 23, line 20. No new matter has been added in view of this amendment. The Sundar and Chaskar references simply do not disclose the concept of an egress portal that is not a WLAN access point or a cell for a WAN detecting a movement of a mobile device from a coverage area of a first network to a coverage area of a second network.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 12, 17, 18, 20, 23, 25, 30 and 39 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. New

dependent claims 40 and 41 include the concept of conducting a present or prior call via the wireless local area network. Support for these new claims can be found on page 7, lines 7-8. Also, new dependent claim 42 includes the idea of the inner border cell being substantially present within the interior of a structure and the outer border cell being substantially present outside the structure. Support for the new claim can be found in FIG. 10 and on page 20, lines 8-10. Applicants also believe that these new dependent claims are patentable over the prior art, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

Telephone:(954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871